

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/659,287	SEPPANEN, AIMO	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Michael I Poe	1732	

**All Participants:**

- (1) Michael I Poe (Examiner).  
 (2) Ellen Emas (Applicant's attorney).

**Status of Application:** Amended After Non-Final Rejection

- (3) \_\_\_\_\_.  
 (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 7 September 2004

**Time:** 3:30 pm

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:  
*None specifically*

Claims discussed:  
*1-5 and 9-16*


Prior art documents discussed:  
*None specifically*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature -- if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called the applicant's attorney to discuss proposed amendments necessary to place the application in condition for allowance. The examiner stipulated that the amendments to claims 1-5 and 9-15 in the amendment filed on August 26, 2004 were sufficient to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, and therefore were allowable for the reasons set forth in the prior Office action. However, the examiner further stipulated that the pending claims were not in condition for allowance due to the presence of non-elected claim 16. As such, the examiner proposed canceling non-elected claim 16 without prejudice. The examiner further proposed amending the title and abstract so that they better reflected the allowed invention (e.g., the method). The applicant's attorney approved the examiner's proposed changes and authorized the examiner to proceed with the changes via Examiner's Amendment. Refer to the Examiner's Amendment for a complete listing of changes.